REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims have been amended in a sincere attempt to place the case immediate condition for allowance. The non-elected Claims (15-24) have been canceled as have Claims 25, 26, and 30-32. Thus the claims before the Examiner are Claims 1, 14, 27-29, and 33.

The rejection of Claims 30-32 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 is moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

The rejection of Claims 11, 14 and 25-33 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 has been noted and the claims have been amended in a sincere attempt to address all of the Examiner's concerns. The claims now indicate that the polyolefinic resin is one "other than an ethylene-vinylacetate copolymer." The phrase "to be a water-insoluble matrix" in Claim 14 has been changed to read "to form a water-insoluble matrix". The term "uncrosslinked crosslinkable" in Claim 14 has been changed to merely "crosslinkable".

The Examiner questioned how a crosslinkable polymer composition could include a crosslinked polyolefin resin. Applicants point out that compositions subjected to crosslinking can contain either a crosslinked or uncrosslinked polyolefinic resin. Claim 14 has also been changed to use the language suggested by the Examiner to indicate that the quantity of the ethylene-vinylacetate copolymer is based upon the total of the water-insoluble matrix. Claim 27 has been revised to make it more clear as well. The criticism of Claim 30 is moot in view of cancellation of that claim.

The rejection of Claims 11, 14, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Hasegawa et al. '264, if applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed. Claims 11 and 14 have been revised to state that the water-insoluble matrix consists essentially of the indicated components and that the composition does not include crosslinked 1,2-polybutadiene.

Application No. 10/646,891 Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2006 and

Advisory Action of July 12, 2006.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended patentably distinguish over

Hasegawa et al. '264 because the patentees specifically require the presence of a particular

water-insoluble substance in the composition for the polishing pad. The claims now before

the Examiner exclude same.

In addition, the present invention is based upon the discovery that using a crosslinked

ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer without crosslinked 1,2-polybutadiene in the water-

insoluble matrix of the polishing part in a polishing pad gives a pad with certain

advantageous properties. The Examiner is directed to Example 1-3 on pages 44 and 50,

Table 1 on page 55, and the related discussion on page 57. The pad of the present invention

has a lower wearing volume and a lower variation of Young's modulus than the pad of

Comparative Example 1-1. The pad of the present invention, moreover, was not cracked and

had excellent formability. It is respectfully submitted that the claims patentably define over

the art.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if additional changes are

required in the case prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTART, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Charles A. Wendel

Registration No. 24,453

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

CW/rac

6